HON'BLE SHRI G.S. SINGHVI, THE CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE G. BHAVANI PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 27912 OF 2005

BETWEEN

A. Sampathi

.....**Petitioner**

And

The Registrar (Administration), High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad & others

.....**Respondents**

:: O R D E R::

Counsel for the Petitioner : Shri M. Ganga Rao

Counsel for the Respondents : Shri C.V. Nagarjuna Reddy

Dated: 28.03.2006

Per G.S. SINGHVI, CJ

In this petition, the petitioner has prayed for quashing orders dated 06.10.2003 and 20.04.2005 passed by District & Sessions Judge, Karimnagar (respondent No.2) and Registrar (Administration), High Court of Andhra Pradesh (respondent No.1) respectively under the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1991.

There is no dispute between the parties that while he was serving as Attender under the jurisdiction of District Judge, Karimnagar, a departmental enquiry was held against the petitioner. At the conclusion of the enquiry, respondent No.2 passed order dated 06.10.2003 whereby he imposed a penalty of stoppage of one grade increment with cumulative effect on the petitioner. The appeal filed against that order was dismissed by respondent No.1 vide his order dated 20.04.2005.

During the pendency of the writ petition, learned counsel for the respondents sought adjournment to enable the administration of the High Court to suo motu review the order of punishment.

Shri V.R.N. Prasanth appearing for Shri C.V. Nagarjuna Reddy, learned standing counsel for the High Court of Andhra Pradesh says that the order of punishment has been reviewed and the punishment has been reduced from stoppage of one increment with cumulative effect to that of stoppage of one increment without cumulative effect. He has produced copy of order dated 24.03.2006 passed by Registrar (General), FAC Registrar (Administration), High Court of Andhra Pradesh. A copy of the order has been supplied to the learned counsel for the writ petitioner.

The learned counsel for the petitioner says that his client is satisfied with the modified penalty.

In view of the statement made by the learned counsel, the writ petition is disposed of as infructuous.

G.S. SINGHVI, CJ

G. BHAVANI PRASAD, J

28.03.2006

ksld